UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,242	11/10/2001	Kenneth Russell Mills	PTU000002	3674

7590 04/20/2004

JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC.
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY
P. O. BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER	
LEE, JOHN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	10

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/007,242	MILLS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN J LEE	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 January 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 18-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 18-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicant's arguments/amendment received on January 30, 2004 have been carefully considered but they are not persuasive because the teaching of the cited references as set forth in the previous rejection reads on all claimed limitation. Thus, the finality of this Office Action is deemed proper.

Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, applicant only argues a modification of a secondary reference (Ven Ryzin) in order to sufficiently modify a primary reference (Bell) is in itself evidence of unobviousness. However, the argument is not persuasive because applicant's argument does not particularly point out the why combination of the references is unobviousness.

Re Claims 1 and 18: Applicant simply argues the teaching of combined references and the claimed limitation "cordless telephone unit having a user interface for conveying information to an end-user" are quite different. However, the Examiner is not clear why the teaching of combined references, specifically Van Ryzin reference, and the claimed limitation are quiet different. More specifically, the applicant's arguments do not show how the difference between the claimed limitation and teaching of the combined references to avoid the references.

Furthermore, The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the teaching of combined references does not teach the claimed invention "cordless telephone unit having a user interface for conveying information to an end-user". Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the Bell teaches cordless telephone unit (D0 in Fig. 1) having a user interface (Fig. 1) for conveying information (voice) to an end-user (D2, Dn in Fig. 1) (see column 2, lines 50 – 63 and column 4, lines 4 – 24). Van Ryzin also teaches transceiver (cordless phone) (132 in Fig.1A) performs the sending the information (conveying information) as obtained from the demodulated signal via the serial control link to the intended recipient (end-user), that is one of devices in multimedia system (see column 40 – 56 and Fig. 1) regarding the claimed limitation.

The claim does not require or limit, as the information can be voice or any information signal.

Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection below for the reasons as to why the claimed limitation is not patentable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-6 and 18-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. (US Patent number 6,405,027) in view of Van Ryzin (US Patent number 6,127,941).

Regarding **claim 1**, Bell discloses that a communication system, comprising:

a cordless telephone system (Fig. 1A) including at least one cordless base station (12 in Fig. 1A) and at least one cordless telephone unit (Fig. 1A) for communicating with the at least one cordless base station (L1 in Fig. 1a and column 3, lines 12 – 38); and

a remote wireless device (D2 in Fig. 1A) configured for communicating with the cordless telephone system (D0 to D2 in Fig. 1A) (column 2, lines 50 – column 3, lines 46), the remote wireless device including a controller (30a in Fig. 2, Bell teaches remote wireless device D0 same as D2..Dn in column 3, lines 12 – 38) which generates or obtains the user information and a transmitter (column 3, lines 12 – 38) which transmits the information to the cordless telephone system (Fig. 1A) to be conveyed at the user interface of the cordless telephone unit (Fig. 1, 2 and column 2, lines 50 – column 3, lines 46).

Bell does not specifically disclose the limitation "a communication system comprises the at least one cordless telephone unit having a user interface for conveying information to an end-user". However, Van Ryzin discloses the limitation "a communication system comprises the at least one cordless telephone unit having a user interface for conveying information to an end-user" (Fig. 1A, 2 and column 4, lines 24 – column 5, lines 57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the Bell structure as taught by Van Ryzin. Doing so would enhance the remote wireless device for signal adaptability in mobile communication system.

Regarding **claim 2**, Bell discloses that the remote wireless device comprises a remote wireless intercom (Fig. 1, 2 and column 3, lines 12 – 38).

Regarding **claim 3**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 2. Furthermore, Bell further discloses that a speaker (Fig. 1, 2);

a microphone (Fig. 1, 2);

a receiver (Fig. 1, 2 and column 3, lines 12 – 38);

a housing which carries the speaker, the microphone, the receiver, and the transmitter (Fig. 1, 2 and column 3, lines 12 – 38); and

wherein the information comprises voice signals, and the speaker, the microphone, the receiver, and the transmitter are used for engaging in an intercom voice communication session with the cordless telephone system (Fig. 1, 2 and column 2, lines 50 – column 3, lines 46).

Regarding **claim 4**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 3. Furthermore, Bell further discloses that the a battery interface used for supplying power to the speaker, the microphone, the receiver, and the transmitter (Bell teaches the remote wireless device could be cellular phone (column 2, lines 50 – 63) and inherently mobile phone has a battery interface used for supplying power to the speaker, the microphone, the receiver, and the transmitter. Without battery in the cellular phone, the phone does not work);

a housing which carries the speaker, the microphone, the receiver, the transmitter, and the battery interface (Fig. 2 and column 3, lines 12 – column 4, lines 49); and

wherein the information comprises voice signals, and the speaker, the microphone, the receiver, and the transmitter are used for engaging in an intercom voice communication session with the cordless telephone system (Fig. 1, 2 and column 3, lines 12 – column 4, lines 49).

Regarding **claim 5**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 3. However, Bell does not specifically disclose the limitation "a remote device includes a communication interface for coupling to and receiving the information from a computer". However, Van Ryzin discloses the limitation "a remote device includes a communication interface for coupling to and receiving the information from a computer" (Fig. 2 and column 6, lines 4 – 54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the Bell structure as taught by Van Ryzin. Doing so would enhance the communicating connection for receiving multimedia signal in mobile communication system.

Regarding **claim 6**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 5. However, Bell does not specifically disclose the limitation "the computer having an application program residing in memory which is executable to generate the information which is sent to the remote wireless device for transmission to the cordless telephone system". However, Van Ryzin discloses the limitation "the computer having an application program residing in memory which is executable to generate the information which is sent to the remote wireless device for transmission to the cordless telephone system" (Fig. 2 and column 6, lines 4 – 54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the Bell structure as taught by Van Ryzin. Doing so would enhance information adaptability from the interface device for providing multimedia signal in mobile communication system.

Regarding **claim 18**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 6. However, Bell does not specifically disclose the limitation "the at least one cordless telephone unit has a user interface including a visual display and a speaker for conveying information". However, Van Ryzin discloses the limitation "the at least one cordless telephone unit has a user interface including a visual display and a speaker for conveying information" (abstract, Fig. 1, 2, and column 2, lines 28 – 56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the Bell structure as taught by Van Ryzin. Doing so would enhance multimedia signal adaptability from the interface device in mobile communication system.

Regarding **claim 19**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 18.

Regarding **claims 20, 21, and 22**, Bell and Van Ryzin disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 6. However, Bell does not specifically disclose the limitation "the application program comprises a scheduling notification program and an electronic mail program, and audio delivery program". However, Van Ryzin discloses the limitation "the application program comprises a scheduling notification program and an electronic mail program, and audio delivery program" (Fig. 2, abstract, and column 6, lines 4 – 54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the Bell structure as taught by Van Ryzin. Doing so would enhance mobile multimedia services for a user in wireless communication system.

4. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell in view of Van Ryzin and in further view of Salazar et al. (US Patent number 5,802,467).

Regarding **claim 7**, Bell and Van Ryzin do not specifically disclose the limitation "the remote wireless device is coupled to and receives the information from a sensor comprising one of a temperature sensor, a weather sensor, or a motion detector sensor". However, Salazar discloses the limitation "the remote wireless device is coupled to and receives the information from a sensor comprising one of a temperature sensor, a weather sensor, or a motion detector sensor" (Fig. 3, 4, abstract, and column 22, lines 33 – column 23, lines 59). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the Bell and Van Ryzin structures as taught by

Salazar. The motivation does so would be to improve signal reception in wireless device in mobile communication system.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **John J. Lee** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5936**. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 8:30am-5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Nay Aung Maung**, can be reached on **(703) 308-7745**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

J.L
April 14, 2004

John J Lee

NICK CORSARO
PATENT EXAMINER